

DECISION NOTICE AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
THOMPSON MEADOW RESTORATION PROJECT
U.S. FOREST SERVICE
PLUMAS NATIONAL FOREST
BECKWOURTH RANGER DISTRICT
PLUMAS COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

DECISION

Based upon my review of the Thompson Meadow Restoration and Water Budget Evaluation Project Environmental Assessment (EA) and Initial Study (IS), I have decided to implement Alternative A, which will restore the natural hydrologic function of 47 acres of degraded meadow along a 0.68 mile reach of Thompson Creek using a variety of restoration techniques including complete fill of the incised channel, in-channel raised riffle rock structures, and partial fill of the incised channel (commonly known as “pond and plug”).

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The primary purpose of the proposed project is to restore channel/floodplain function of degraded meadow in order to reestablish the historical meadow water table elevation, stabilize eroding stream banks, improve water quality, attenuate flood flows, and restore meadow vegetation. A second objective of the proposed project is to improve the quality and quantity of woody and non-woody riparian vegetation along stream reaches to improve wildlife habitat and livestock forage. A full water budget evaluation before and after project implementation will be conducted to inform future meadow restoration projects.

Thompson Creek is a tributary to McReynolds Creek, which flows to Red Clover Creek in northeastern Plumas County. The project area is located solely on National Forest System lands within the Beckwourth Ranger District of the Plumas National Forest (PNF), approximately 11 air miles north of Portola, CA, in the vicinity of Red Clover Valley, and lies within T25N, R13E, Sections 25 and 36, Mount Diablo Base Meridian.

DECISION RATIONALE

The Thompson Meadow Restoration and Water Budget Evaluation Project EA/IS documents the environmental analysis and conclusions upon which this decision is based. The EA describes the environmental effects of two project alternatives, Alternative A (the proposed action) and Alternative B (no action). All environmental resources that would potentially be affected, either positively or negatively, were analyzed in the EA including cultural resources, wildlife, plants, air quality, soils, and water resources.

Alternative A meets the project purposes and objectives. Implementation of Alternative A will result in substantial improvement of hydrologic and habitat conditions in the meadow area. Alternative A will restore the natural water table elevation. Groundwater retention will improve, particularly during the spring and summer months. The existing incised channel has effectively lowered the water table and caused a change from wetter plant habitat types to drier scrub habitat types. The restored water table will be available to the rooting zone near the stream channel and will convert plant communities from primarily a xeric community, dominated by sagebrush, to a moist plant community. This conversion will improve habitat for small mammals by increasing the availability of cover and forage. The restoration of willow riparian cover will benefit bird species. Livestock forage will also substantially improve due to this conversion. New fencing along the restored stream channel will create a 20-acre riparian pasture that will allow seasonal management of livestock use in this area of high value wildlife habitat.

Alternative A will also restore natural floodplain function by reconnecting the entrenched eroding stream channel to the meadow floodplain, which will allow the stream to spill out onto the meadow more frequently. Allowing flood flows to access the meadow floodplain will result in deposition of instream fine sediment supplies rather than being transported to downstream reaches. Spreading flood flows across the meadow will reduce streambank erosion by reducing the concentrated flow velocities and stream energy that occur in the current confined channel incision. Excessive erosion currently seen at channel headcuts will be addressed with rock structures. Existing studies generally indicate improvements in summer streamflow within meadows similarly restored (EA, p. 81). Streamflow improvements are expected to be more pronounced early in the runoff season. However, given the small area of the project meadow, Alternative A is not expected to measurably affect streamflow either positively or negatively when considered at scales beyond the Thompson Creek watershed (EA, p. 81).

Summer instream water temperature within the project reach is expected to improve as a result of increased groundwater retention (EA, p. 79). Warmer temperatures will likely occur at the surface of borrow areas filled by groundwater and upstream of rock riffle structures but temperatures will remain cool in the bottom areas of these pools.

Project design features will prevent the spread or introduction of invasive plant species (EA, pp. 60-61). Similar past meadow restoration projects indicate that there is a risk of excessive erosion of segments of the constructed project, particularly during the first flood season after construction when restored plant communities are not yet established. The three-mile-long project on Red Clover Creek that was constructed on PNF lands near the Poco Creek tributary in 2010 has experienced the most plug erosion of any partial channel fill restoration constructed on PNF lands in the upper Feather River watershed (EA, p. 76). However, several design features have been incorporated to satisfactorily address this risk, including the use of rock structures and transplanted vegetation. Additionally, the magnitude and depth of flood flows in this project area will be much smaller than those that occur in the much larger Red Clover Creek watershed.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

This project was first listed as a proposal on the Plumas National Forest Schedule of Proposed Actions in October 2017. The PNF presented a detailed description of the proposed action (Alternative A) and solicited public comments during a 30-day scoping period that started

November 8, 2017. Public legal notices announcing the opportunity to comment were published on that date in three local newspapers: Feather River Bulletin, Portola Reporter, and Indian Valley Record. Additionally, thirty individuals, organizations, government agencies, Indian tribes, and Native American organizations were mailed a letter from the PNF announcing the opportunity to comment. These organizations and agencies included the Plumas County Board of Supervisors, Feather River Resource Conservation District, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and downstream water users. Two comments were received. One was from USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service, which expressed support for the project, particularly the extensive monitoring program to study pre- and post-project hydrologic effects of restoration.

The second comment received was from a group of irrigators and agricultural producers in Indian Valley who expressed opposition to the project due to impacts to their operations that could potentially result from implementation of the proposed project. These potential impacts included reduced water available to downstream water right holders; undesirable habitat created by groundwater ponds that would form in meadow borrow areas; and risk of erosion of the constructed project. These potential issues were satisfactorily analyzed in the EA (pp. 15-19). As stated above, Alternative A is not expected to measurably affect streamflow either positively or negatively for water users that divert streamflow from Red Clover Creek and design features have been incorporated in the project to address erosion risk.

PNF released the draft environmental assessment for the project on January 8, 2020. Public legal notices of the 30-day opportunity to comment were published on that date in the same three local newspapers. Additionally, the same thirty individuals, organizations, government agencies, Indian tribes, or Native American organizations who were contacted regarding the proposed action in 2017 were mailed a letter from PNF announcing the opportunity to comment on the draft EA. Since California Department of Water Resources was concurrently analyzing the proposed action per regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the draft EA document was combined with the CEQA Initial Study.

Two comments were received by PNF. The first was from the Forest's former watershed program manager, who is familiar with the project site and its restoration needs. This letter was supportive of the Alternative A design.

The second comment was received from the same group of irrigators and agricultural producers who commented on the proposed action in 2017. This email did not raise any new issues but asked PNF to again consider the potential issues expressed in their 2017 comment. Additionally, the comment asked the Forest to consider a 2011 resolution from the Plumas County Board of Supervisors intended to protect water rights holders near restoration projects and a 2013 PNF report regarding effects of meadow restoration on stream flow. Both of these documents, as well as the commenters' 2017 issues, were considered in the draft EA (pp. 15-19). The 2013 PNF study, as well as other existing studies regarding flow effects of meadow restoration, were thoroughly analyzed in the EA (pp. 80-82). No known water right diversions exist on Thompson Creek or McReynolds Creek and any changes in streamflow would not be measureable in Red Clover Creek (EA, p. 81). California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Division of Water Rights responded to a complaint from these same commenters in 2011 and performed an investigation in the upper Feather River watershed (EA p. 19). SWRCB found that similar meadow restoration projects did not result in a consumptive use of water in the restored meadows that would be significantly different from the consumptive use that existed prior to

meadow and channel degradation and that the complainants did not document any injury to their water rights due to past restoration projects. The commenters expressed their opinion that Alternative A would affect their water availability but did not present data or studies to dispute the EA analysis. Therefore, no changes to the draft EA were made as a result of this comment.

Copies of the comments received during the 2017 scoping and the 2020 draft EA comment periods, as well as the list of parties that were mailed letters notifying of the opportunity to comment, are available in the project record at the Beckwourth Ranger District in Blairsden, California.

FINDINGS REQUIRED BY OTHER LAWS AND REGULATIONS

I find that this project is consistent with the standards and guidelines for land management activities described in the 1988 Plumas National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan as amended by the 2004 Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision (SNFPA ROD). Implementation of Alternative A will measurably move existing conditions in the meadow toward the standards, guidelines, and desired conditions presented in the SNFPA ROD (EA pp. 4-5). The meadow floodplain will again be connected to the stream channel, dissipating the energy from high flows. Sites of accelerated erosion, including the large headcut near the downstream end of the project, will be stabilized. The water table and the species composition and structural diversity of meadow plant and animal communities will be restored. Significant cultural resource sites will no longer be impacted by accelerated erosion. Therefore, this project is consistent with the requirements of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (EA, p. 99). In addition, the Project complies with the Endangered Species Act (EA, pp. 99-100), the Clean Water Act (EA, pp. 100-101), the Clean Air Act (EA, p. 101), and the National Historic Preservation Act (EA, p. 101).

In addition to the EA, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was considered (see below). I determined these actions will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will not be prepared.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

CEQ regulations define a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) as a document by a Federal agency briefly presenting the reasons why an action, not otherwise excluded (§1508.4), will not have a significant effect on the human environment and for which an environmental impact statement therefore will not be prepared. It shall include the environmental assessment or a summary of it and shall note any other environmental documents related to it (§1501.7(a)(5)).

As the responsible official, I am responsible for evaluating the effects of the project relative to the definition of significance established by the CEQ Regulations (40 CFR §1508.13). I have reviewed and considered the EA and documentation included in the project record, and I have determined that Alternative A will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. As a result, no environmental impact statement will be prepared. My rationale for this finding is as follows, organized by sub-section of the CEQ definition of significance cited above.

Context

For the project alternatives, the context of the environmental effects is based on the environmental analysis in the project EA. When considering whether environmental impacts are significant, the Council on Environmental Quality requires that the action "...be analyzed in several contexts such as society as a whole (human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies with the setting of the proposed action. For instance, in the case of a site-specific action, significance would usually depend upon the effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole. Both short- and long-term effects are relevant" (40 CFR §1508.27 (a)).

The activities in the Thompson Meadow Restoration Project are site-specific and will occur over a remote area of public land within Plumas County, California that is small relative to the 1,783-acre watershed for Thompson Creek, and very small relative to the 37,000-acre Lower Red Clover Creek watershed. Under the action alternative, the majority of treatments will occur within the 47-acre meadow along a reach of Thompson Creek that is 0.6 mile long. Stream flow along this reach is perennial, but the rate of flow is very low, rarely exceeding 0.1 cubic feet per second through the summer months. The hydrologic and biological effects of Alternative A along the stream will be profound and prompt, due to a lasting change in water table elevation of several feet within the first year after implementation, which will result in restoring the water table to within the rooting depth of moist meadow vegetation species. Excavation of soil from the nearby hillside will result in re-contouring of the hillside and harvest of all forest species within that area (up to approximately 3 acres). Effects are not expected to be long-lasting since the re-contoured hillside will have drainage patterns similar to existing, topsoil will be stockpiled before excavation and replaced, and native plant species will be planted. Drainage improvements along the project access road will prevent sedimentation during the project and will provide long-term reductions in erosion potential from the road.

The environmental effects of this project are local in nature and will not significantly affect the human environment at regional, national, or global scales. This is discussed in more detail in the following "Intensity" section. Effects on the environment are limited by the proposal's relatively small scale, along with the implementation of design features and Forest Plan standards and guidelines. The physical, biological, and social effects of the project were analyzed at appropriate scales within the project area and adjacent to the project area.

Intensity

Intensity is a measure of the severity, extent, or quantity of effects, and is based on information from the effects analysis of this EA and the references in the project record. The effects of this project have been appropriately and thoroughly considered with an analysis that is responsive to concerns and issues raised by the public. Plumas National Forest has taken a hard look at the environmental effects using relevant scientific information and knowledge of site-specific conditions gained from field visits. My finding of no significant impact is based on the context of the project and intensity of effects, discussed below, using the ten factors identified in 40 CFR §1508.27(b).

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the effect will be beneficial.

The design of the project, including measures to minimize or avoid effects, limits the intensity of effects that may result with the selected alternative. As stated above, the geographic extent of the Alternative A activities will be limited. The project will improve conditions within the project area but the benefits and possible adverse effects are not likely to be noticeable outside the project area. The effects of my decision to implement Alternative A are discussed in the environmental assessment by resource (EA, pp. 29-31, 37-54, 58-61, 64-65, 72-87). More detail on the effects may be found in the environmental assessment and the specialist reports.

The effects are not significant in terms of intensity when considered in various contexts, and they are within the range of effects identified in the Forest Plan, as amended. My determination does not rely on beneficial effects overriding adverse effects.

2. The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety.

The selected alternative will not have significant effects on public health and safety. Safety of the public and personnel implementing the project was considered during project design. Integrated design features are incorporated in the project to ensure visitor and worker safety, protect water quality, and prevent release of hazardous materials. During project implementation, traffic would increase from moving equipment in and out, hauling rock to the site, and personnel travel to and from the project area. Traffic management in accordance with standard contract provisions would mitigate risks to workers and provide for safe public travel. There are potential short-term effects to public health and safety related to increased truck traffic on the rock haul route from Crocker Pit. These would be short term and temporary impacts and design features in place to minimize impacts. Expected long-term environmental effects of the meadow restoration treatments are not expected to affect public health or safety.

3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as the proximity to historical or cultural resources, parklands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

There are cultural resources in the project area, and the project is designed to protect them (EA, pp.64-65). A Maidu Tribal Monitor and a qualified Forest Service approved archaeologist will be present during project implementation in proximity to two culturally significant sites that are within and adjacent to the project area. If unanticipated cultural resource materials are discovered during construction, all earth-moving activity within and around the immediate discovery area would cease until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find. Park lands, prime farmlands, wild and scenic rivers, and ecologically critical areas do not occur in or adjacent to the project area. A formal delineation of wetlands and other waters of the United States that may be regulated by US Army Corps of Engineers under the Clean Water Act Section 404 was conducted for the project. Alternative A will restore natural floodplain function by reconnecting the entrenched eroding stream channel to the meadow floodplain, which will allow the stream to spill out onto the meadow more frequently. This in turn will restore the areal extent

of potential wetlands in the meadow. Compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act would be assured per the preconstruction notification process required by US Army Corps of Engineers for nationwide permit 27 (Aquatic Habitat Restoration, Establishment, and Enhancement Activities).

4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.

The term “controversial” in this context refers to cases where substantial scientific dispute exists as to the size, nature, or effects of a major Federal action on some human environmental factor, rather than to public opposition of a proposed action or alternative. The proposed project follows the management direction in the 1988 Plumas National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan as amended by the 2004 Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision. Potential adverse effects are minimized through design and the incorporation of project design features (EA, Appendix A). The cultural resources design features are described above. Construction activities would occur during the dry time of the year when stream flow in Thompson Creek is at its lowest, protecting water quality and aquatic habitat. Prior to construction in each treatment reach, native fish, as well as non-native fish, would be removed from each work area and transported to the nearest area with adequate suitable habitat. To avoid the proliferation of weeds, all equipment would be cleaned to ensure it is free of soil, seeds, vegetative matter, or other debris that could contain seeds before mobilization onto PNF. While some public commenters are opposed in general to some of the meadow restoration techniques to be utilized under Alternative A, those potential issues were adequately considered and analyzed in the EA and project effects will not be measurable outside of close proximity to the project site.

5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

The actions are similar to actions implemented in other areas on National Forest System lands within the Plumas National Forest administrative boundary. Effects will be similar to those of past actions. Public scoping or other communication with the public and stakeholders did not reveal any highly uncertain, unique, or unknown risks associated with the effects of the project. The Forest Service has considerable experience with this type of activity and given the limited context of the project, the effects to the human environment are not significant or outside what would be expected with a project of this type. I find that the effects of this project are well established and predictable. I conclude there are no unique or unusual characteristics of the area which have not been previously encountered or which constitute highly uncertain or unknown risks to the human environment.

6. The degree to which the action may establish precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

This is a site-specific project that does not set precedence for any future actions or present a decision in principle about future considerations. Any proposed future project must be evaluated on its own merits and effects. Management practices are consistent with the forest plan, as amended. I find that the project will not establish any precedent for any future actions.

7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance exists if it is reasonable to anticipate a cumulatively significant impact on the environment. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into small component parts.

The combined effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions were considered and are summarized in the cumulative effects analysis for each resource (EA, pp. 40-53, 59-60, 74-82, 91-92). Past actions considered in the cumulative effects analyses include those that contributed to the baseline conditions in the project area. The analysis of cumulative effects in the environmental assessment follows the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations (36 CFR §220.4(f)). Based upon review of the analysis in the environmental assessment and project record, I find that the project does not represent a potential cumulative significant impact on the environment. There are no indications of significant cumulative effects to the environment, and direct and indirect effects will be minor.

8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

The project is not expected to have any adverse effects to historic properties or cultural resources. The Plumas National Forest complies with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act by complying with the *First Amended Programmatic Agreement Among the U.S.D.A. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region (Region 5), California State Historic Preservation Officer, Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Process for Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for Management of Historic Properties by the National Forests of the Pacific Southwest Region*. Archaeological resources would be protected from impact with the exception of two very small locations along the existing channel and the slight modification and use of an access road. In both cases, the impact was determined to be minimal. Standard protection measures outlined in Appendix E of the Programmatic Agreement will be applied as needed including avoidance, utilization of buffer zones, and boundary delineation (e.g. flagging, staking or protective temporary fencing). As per 36 §CFR 800.5(d)(1), the California State Historic Preservation Officer concurred with PNF's finding of no adverse effect to historic

properties for the proposed Thompson Meadow Restoration Project on May 6, 2019 fulfilling the agency's responsibilities under Section 106.

9. The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 USC 1531 et seq.) requires that any action authorized by a federal agency not be likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a threatened or endangered species (TES) or result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat of such species that is determined to be critical. Section 7 of the ESA, as amended, requires the responsible federal agency to consult with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) concerning TES under their jurisdiction. It is USFS policy to analyze impacts to TES to ensure management activities are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a TES or result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat of such species that is determined to be critical. This analysis is documented in a Biological Assessment and two Biological Evaluations. The BA (BA) and BEs include evaluation of potential effects to TES, terrestrial and aquatic wildlife, sensitive habitats, and sensitive plant species, and is summarized and incorporated by reference in the project EA. No federally listed anadromous fish species occur in the Feather River watershed due to the downstream dam at Lake Oroville, and thus no species list is necessary from the NMFS. A list of federal endangered and threatened terrestrial and aquatic wildlife species that may be affected by the project was received from the USFWS on November 14, 2018. Based on the analysis conducted in the BA for potential effects to TES, it was determined that the proposed project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, the gray wolf or Sierra Nevada yellow-legged frog. USFWS issued a letter of concurrence with the PNF determination on May 9, 2019.

The USFWS list of federal endangered and threatened species that may be affected by the proposed project did not contain any plant species. No federally listed plant species are known to occur within the project area and no federally listed plants were identified during botanical surveys. Therefore, the proposed project will result in no effect to federally listed plant species.

10. Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

The environmental assessment analyzed the effects of the project, in part, to determine consistency with law, regulation, and policy. See previous discussion of "Findings Required by Other Laws and Regulations." Applicable laws and regulations were considered for each resource analyzed in the environmental assessment. The proposed action with associated integrated design features, was developed to be consistent with all applicable laws or requirements for the protection of the environment, including the forest plan, as amended.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW (APPEAL) OPPORTUNITIES

This draft decision is subject to the objection process pursuant to 36 CFR §218, Subparts A and B.

Eligibility to File Objections

Objections will be accepted only from those who have previously submitted specific written comments regarding the proposed project either during scoping or other designated opportunity for public comment in accordance with §218.5(a). Issues raised in objections must be based on previously submitted timely, specific written comments regarding the proposed project unless based on new information arising after designated opportunities.

Individual members of organizations must have submitted their own comments to meet the requirements of eligibility as an individual, objections received on behalf of an organization are considered as those of the organization only. If an objection is submitted on behalf of a number of individuals or organizations, each individual or organization listed must meet the eligibility requirement of having previously submitted comments on the project (§218.7). Names and addresses of objectors will become part of the public record.

Contents of an Objection

Incorporation of documents by reference in the objection is permitted only as provided for at §218.8(b). Minimum content requirements of an objection are identified in (§218.8(d) include:

- Objector's name, address, and telephone number if available; with signature or other verification of authorship supplied upon request;
- Identification of the lead objector when multiple names are listed, along with verification upon request;
- Name of project, name and title of the responsible official, national forest/ranger district of project;
- Sufficient narrative description of those aspects of the proposed project objected to, specific issues related to the project, how environmental law, regulation, or policy would be violated, and suggested remedies which would resolve the objection; and,
- Statement demonstrating the connection between prior specific written comments on this project and the content of the objection, unless the objection issue arose after the designated opportunity(ies) for comment.

Filing an Objection

Written objections, including any attachments, must be filed (regular mail, email, hand-delivery, or express delivery) with the Reviewing Officer Christopher Carlton, Forest Supervisor, c/o Katherine Carpenter, Environmental Coordinator, 159 Lawrence Street, Quincy, CA, 95971

within 45 days following the publication date of the legal notice in the newspaper of record, the Feather River Bulletin. The office business hours for those submitting hand-delivered objections are: 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM, Monday through Friday, excluding holidays. Electronic objections must be submitted in a format such as an email message, portable document file (.pdf), plain text (.txt), rich text format (.rtf), and Word (.doc or .docx) to: objections-pacificsouthwest-plumas@usda.gov.

Please put Thompson Meadow Restoration Project in the subject line of the message. It is the responsibility of Objectors to ensure their objection is received in a timely manner (§218.9).

The publication date in the Feather River Bulletin, newspaper of record, is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an objection of this project. Those wishing to object to this proposed project should not rely upon dates or timeframe information provided by any other source.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE

If no objections are filed within the 45-day time period, implementation of the decision may occur on, but not before, five days following the close of the objection filing period. When objections are filed, implementation may occur following the issuance of the Review Officer's letter and once any instructions are addressed.

CONTACT

For additional information concerning this decision, contact: Joe Hoffman, Forest Hydrologist, Plumas National Forest, 159 Lawrence Street, Quincy, CA, 95971, or via email at joseph.hoffman@usda.gov or telephone at 530-283-7868.

Matthew Jedra

Date

District Ranger

Beckwourth Ranger District

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotope, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at http://www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_cust.html and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov.

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer and lender.